

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION
CORPORATION,

Plaintiff-Applicant,

v.

BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT
SECURITIES LLC,

Defendant.

Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (CGM)

SIPA Liquidation

(Substantively Consolidated)

In re:

BERNARD L. MADOFF,

Debtor.

IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee for the
Substantively Consolidated SIPA Liquidation
of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities
LLC and Bernard L. Madoff,

Plaintiff,

v.

BANQUE LOMBARD ODIER & CIE SA,

Defendant.

Adv. Pro. No. 12-01693 (CGM)

**NOTICE OF JOINDER IN OBJECTING DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
TRUSTEE'S MOTION FOR ORDER AMENDING ORDER APPOINTING A
DISCOVERY ARBITRATOR PURSUANT TO BANKRUPTCY RULE 9019(c) AND
GENERAL ORDER M-390**

Defendant Banque Lombard Odier & Cie SA ("Lombard Odier"), in Adv. Pro.
No. 12-01693 (CGM), hereby objects to the Motion for Order Amending Order Appointing a
Discovery Arbitrator Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019(c) and General Order M-390, filed in

Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (CGM), ECF 23449, 23454 (“Trustee’s Motion”), by Irving H. Picard, as trustee for the liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC and the estate of Bernard L. Madoff (“Trustee”), and joins in all aspects of the Opposition to the Trustee’s Motion, ECF 23516, filed by Objecting Defendants, except for ¶¶ 8, 19 (third sentence), 32-38 and the final sentence of the Conclusion paragraph.

Lombard Odier is a party to one of the adversary proceedings, referred to by the Trustee as the Subsequent Transfer Cases, in which the Case Management Plan does not provide for mandatory discovery arbitration, and as such, the fallback position advocated by Objecting Defendants in their Opposition – that, at a minimum, the Court deny the Trustee’s Motion only with respect to adversary proceedings with previously entered Case Management Plans that (1) provide for mandatory discovery arbitration and (2) cite the existing Order Appointing a Discovery Arbitrator – would not be adequate to protect the rights of Lombard Odier, which is in all other relevant respects identically situated to Objecting Defendants.

Because the Trustee has failed to justify the modification to the Order Appointing a Discovery Arbitrator he seeks, under either Rule 60(b)(5) or Rule 60(b)(6), the Trustee’s Motion should be denied in its entirety as to all defendants who are parties to the Subsequent Transfer cases.

Dated: September 6, 2023
New York, New York

ALLEGAERT BERGER & VOGEL LLP

By: /s/ John F. Zulack

John F. Zulack
Lauren J. Pincus
David A. Shaiman
111 Broadway, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10006
Tel No.: 212-571-0550
Email: jzulack@abv.com

Email: lpincus@abv.com
Email: dshaiman@abv.com

MAYER BROWN LLP

By: /s/ Mark G. Hanchet
Mark G. Hanchet
Kevin C. Kelly
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Tel. No.: 212-506-2500
Email: mhanchet@mayerbrown.com
Email: kkelly@mayerbrown.com

Marc R. Cohen
1999 K St NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. No.: 202-263-5282
Email: mcohen@mayerbrown.com

Counsel for Defendant Lombard Odier & Cie SA